

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,042	02/11/2000		Albert D. Baker	Baker 21-4	6042
7	590	09/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Joseph B. Ry	an		LY, ANH VU H		
Ryan & Mason, L.L.P. 90 Forest Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Locust Valley, NY 11560				2667	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-16				
Advisory Action	09/503,042	BAKER ET AL.					
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Anh-Vu H Ly	2667					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 July 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
<ul><li>(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE: .</li></ul>							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>11-13 and 24-26</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10, 14-23, and 27</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	*					
10. Other:							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues on pages 2-3 that Araujo et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the communication link for which the link type is automatically determined is external to the local network and part of the one or more additional networks and applicant further argues that in the final office action mailed on April 23, 2004, examiner assumed that (figs. 1a-b) the local network included the CPE and central office and the external networks were backbone networks 137. And since the link determination was betweent the CPE and the central office, therefore, Araujo does not anticipate the claims. However, as illustrated in Figs. 1A-B, Araujo discloses a method of automatically configuring a link between an end station and an intermediate device (gateway or central office) that is coupled to a portion of a network. Herein, the local network can be assumed as either the CPE and the central office or the central office and the backbone network and the external network can be either the central office and the backbone network or the central office and the CPE. Therefore, as considered by the examiner, the local network is the network including the central office and the backbone network, while the external network includes the central office and the CPE. And since the link determination is between the CPE and the central office therefore it is external to the local network.

CHI PHAM

9/27/04

TECHNOLOGY C